(Recognition of Forest Rights) Rules, 2008 have been framed and notified on 01.01.2008 at the national level by the Ministry of Tribal Affaris. The State/Union Territory Governments, therefore, are not to frame the rules under the Act.

(b) The State/Union Territory Governments have to implement the Act. So far no such incident of harrasng the tribals have been reported to the Central Government.

(c) Does not arise. However, the Government of India had issued guidelines to the State/ Union Territory Governments *vide* its letter dated 21.12.2004 for discontinuance of eviction of tribals.

Coal to oil project of Tatas

*376. DR. V. MAITREYAN: Will the PRIME MINSITER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Inter Ministerial Group (IMG) has approved a huge project of Tatas with Sasol of South Africa for coal to oil project;

(b) if so, the total cost of the project;

(c) whether there are similar projects waiting for clearance from Government and if so, the details thereof and the time by when they would be approved;

(d) the estimated quantity of oil that is going to be converted from coal and the cost efficiency of the project; and

(e) by when this project would be commissioned?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COAL (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): (a) to (e) Yes, Sir. The Inter Ministerial Group of the Planning Commission has considered the proposal of Tata-Sasol coal to Liquids project and recommended for consideration of Ministry of Coal for allotting coal blocks. The indicated cost of the project is US$ 6 to 8 billion. The Tata-Sasol proposal aims at establishing coal to liquid facility for 3.6 Million Tonne per annum of oil and oil products.

Apart from the above proposal, M/s. Reliance Industries, Essar, Jindal Steel & Power Ltd. and Adani Group have also indicated their interests to pursue Coal to Oil projects. These proposals do not contain details of costing, capacity etc.

The subject of conversion of Coal of Oil is under examination in the Ministry of Coal.

Misleading information under RTI Act

*377. SHRIMATI SYEDA ANWARA TAIMUR:
SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA:

Will the Minister of SHIPPING, ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether his Ministry had provided misleading information under RTI Act stating that the "purpose of Minister's visit to Panama and Cairo from 4-10 November, 2004 was not known and that the trip was not sponsored by the Department";

(b) if so, whether it was later on, after it had appeared in print media, explained that he had visited Egypt and Panama in 2004 accompanied by senior officials, and held several meetings with canal authorities and Government; and

(c) who is responsible for providing misleading information under RTI Act and the action taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING, ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): (a) and (b) An application seeking information under Right to Information (RTI) Act regarding foreign tours of the Central Ministers during the tenure of United Progressive Alliance (UPA) Government was made by the applicant to the Ministry of Home Affair, who under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, transferred the application, to all the Ministries/Departments for sending the information pertaining to them directly to the applicant.

As per RTI Act, reply to the RTI application is given by the concerned Public Information Officer of the respective Departments. The Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport & Highways comprises of two Departments namely Department of Road Transport & Highways and Department of Shipping having their own designated Public Information Officers. The reply sent in respect of the RTI application was given by the Department of Road Transport & Highways on the basis of the information available with that Department at that point of time. The information relating to visit to the two countries i.e. Egypt and Panama in the year 2004 related to the Department of Shipping. The purpose of this visit was not known to the Department of Road Transport & Highways as it was not sponsored by them.

Subsequently the position was clarified taking into account the information available with the Department of Shipping with a view to explain the position with reference to a report which appeared in a newspaper. Additional information was also furnished to the applicant.

(c) The information was supplied to the applicant by Public Information Officer (PIO) of Department of Road Transport & Highways. Action is being initiated against him for providing incomplete information.

Difference in socio-economic standards among States

†*378. SHRI RAJ MOHINDER SINGH MAJITHA:
DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the gap in socio-economic standards of existing 28 States of the country has become a matter of concern;

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(c) whether Government has identified the backward and developed States separately and if so, the names thereof; and

(d) whether any provision has been made to implement Special Development Scheme in backward as well as most backward States during the Eleventh Five Year Plan period?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) In order to bridge the gap in socio-economic standards, the Government is focusing on Flagship Schemes in critical sectors, such as National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme (NREGP), National Rural Health Mission (NRHM), Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), Mid-Day Meal Scheme (MDMS), Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS)

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.